

## Risk Analysis

---

---

### Comments

E-0012/004

[Why] isn't there a "just clean up Hanford, w/o imports" option?

E-0047/035

An alternative that does not import new waste and only treats and disposes of Hanford only waste.

E-0048/007

The EIS does not provide an adequate alternative to importing more toxic waste. There should be an option in the plan to clean up existing hazardous waste at Hanford without importing more waste. It appears that the EIS currently just considers stopping all cleanup if no more waste is imported.

E-0051/001

First of all, the EIS should have described and discussed the implications of an alternative WITHOUT outside waste shipments to the area. Such an alternative is warranted because this action would contravene earlier stakeholder agreements, and frankly, its omission raises suspicions about the ultimate fate of such waste.

L-0017/003

The options presented in this EIS do not provide adequate information on the risk of waste streams coming to Hanford.

TSE-0010/002

This Environmental Impact Statement should be withdrawn. We want -- I want the U.S. Department of Energy to have a realistic alternative of no new off-site waste import. This should be analyzed.

TSE-0031/012

It [DSWEIS] talks about an upper bound scenario, which is 50 percent greater than the Hanford only scenario. But it does this in terms of volume only, and not in terms of risk, risk to humans and risk to the environment.

### Response

The Hanford Only waste volume has been evaluated in all action alternatives and the No Action Alternative to provide a better comparison with the impacts of adding offsite waste. The incremental impacts of offsite waste are the differences between the Lower and Upper Bound Volumes and the Hanford Only impacts for a given alternative.

Risk analysis is used throughout the HSW EIS. See Volume I Section 5 in the EIS and Volume II Appendices F, G, H, I and L.